

CENSUS BUREAU PRESS BRIEFING
JANUARY 12, 2011

STAN ROLARK: Good afternoon. My name is Stan Rolark. I'm Chief of the Census Bureau's Public Information Office.

Welcome everybody. Happy New Year. We're happy to have all of you; certainly the ones who braved the weather to come in today, we're very happy that you did. We're also happy to have all of those on the phone.

This morning, Dr. Robert Groves, Census Bureau Director, will present to you today a discussion about our quality measures used for Census, as well as the redistricting data count releases. So he'll discuss all of that.

And usual, you can go to our website, *www.census.gov*. Once you go there, we have an icon in the upper left-hand corner of our homepage. You click on that, you can get a copy of all of the slides that he'll be discussing today.

We also have this broadcasted across the Web today as well.

What we're going to do, once the presentation is over, we'll open it up for questions and answers to the press. We'll alternate between questions from those here in attendance, as well as those on the phone.

So without further ado, I'd like to bring Dr. Robert Groves.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Thank you, Stan. Welcome. And I welcome those people on the Web who are listening in, or watching in.

On December 21st, before the turn of the year, we released the 2010 official state population counts and the national count. And as you know, those numbers shifted 12 seats in the House of Representatives that were spread around 18 states.

When we released those, we had had those numbers only for a few days. And we have now placed them in the context of other data we have. And we wanted to share that with you, because this is one of the ways we evaluate the Census and try to get deeper insight into what our society looks like right now. I'm also going to alert you to some things that are coming up, releases that are of great importance as well, as Stan mentioned.

In the past, I've noted that there are three methods of evaluating a Census. One of them is to keep track of how the data collection activities proceeded. We call those process indicators, and I'll give you some results from analysis of those.

Another tool is to compare the results of the 2010 Census with other ways of measuring the population. And we have two principal ones that I want to talk about today.

And then finally, the third way that we evaluate how good a Census is, is to do a very large sample survey that we call a post-enumeration survey, that, in a very detailed way, attempts to check whether we found all the houses and all the people that we should have, and we counted them in the right place.

I want to go through those three things briefly, to tell you where we are on getting results from those.

So I'll start with these things we call process indicators. These are the things that we track during data collection. I first remind us that after one event in the spring of 2009, where we had an overrun in the address canvassing operation, we were able to finish all the other operations – and there are a whole lot of operations in a decennial Census – on time and under budget. Things went smoothly from sort of a macro level.

I also remind us that when we finally tabulated the participation rate, a way that we try to estimate what percent of the households returned the form by mail, that we came up to about 74% of the households doing so that equaled the short form rate in the year 2000. But remember, the year 2000 had both a short form and a long form. When you combine the short form and long form return rate it was actually lower than we got this year.

So overall, we did better in this Census. We did about the same short-form-to-short-form comparison, but we had a higher percentage of the households returning forms. We can say that honestly.

We also have reported that on the downside, when we went out and knocked on doors and asked people to respond face-to-face, that despite going back to these houses six times, we found a larger percent of households that we had to rely on building managers and neighbors to supply the information about population. That was about 22% of the households that we followed up on, compared to 17% in 2000. That's a bad sign on the face of it.

We now know a little more about that. And I can say that the percentage of people in the final Census count that we delivered on December 21st, that had usable data, either from a mail-back form or a face-to-face interview, is really quite high. It's virtually the same as in the 2000 Census.

So the numbers are, in the 2010 Census, 99.60% of the population either mailed back their form or got usable information from building managers or other proxies – so that was 99.60 – versus 99.57 in the year 2000. These are virtually the same numbers.

So a very, very high percentage of the houses we measured and the people we measured came through this process of face-to-face interviews and mail-backs. That basically

means those proxy interviews that we did indeed take higher than normal, produced disproportionately quite usable data for us. That's a good sign for this Census.

So those are process indicators. Let me move on to two, actually three different ways that provide corroborating evidence, you might say. One of these is called demographic analysis. And for those of you who've been following this story for some months, you know on December 6th, we released something that we call demographic analysis.

Now, what is that? That's another way to estimate a national total population. It uses not Census data, but birth and death registration data, and estimates of in-migration and out-migration. I noted on that day that, after gathering together the best demographers we could from this country, and talking about how to estimate the immigration count, they came to the conclusion that there was no consensus on what that number should be. So we presented five different estimates of the population based on that, because of the difficulty principally of estimating in-migrants.

If you look at the slide that we'll put on the plasma here, we can now compare the 2010 official national count to these alternative estimates. If you look at this slide, they are arrayed on the line from the high demographic estimate to the— from the low to the high. And if you, again, look at the plasma, the red point is the 2010 official Census count. This is very, very close to the middle estimate of the demographic analysis. It's within, in fact, .09% of that number; they're virtually the same.

How do we react to this as statisticians and demographers? This is a comforting fact, that we do something completely independent of the Census that has its own integrity, although problematic, because of difficulty of estimating components, and we basically get similar information, a similar story out of that.

Now, there's another point on this graph which is in green. We have another way of estimating the population that we do continuously throughout the decade. In fact, we're

beginning it again now. We take the last Census. In this case, we took the Census of 2000; that was sort of our benchmark, our foundation. And then we started letting the population— we got birth data and death data, immigration, emigration, and we grew the population based on that foundation. It is different from demographic analysis because it rests on the 2000 Census. Demographic analysis, completely independent of Census data.

The green point is the point that we had on population estimates on April 1, 2010. So we can ask the question, how does the official 2010 count compare to the April 1, 2010 version of the national population estimate? It's within 0.8%.

So we now have three different ways of estimating that same number – how many people live in the United States on April 1, 2010. They basically give very similar answers. This is very comforting to us as statisticians and demographers.

Now, we have a third way that's relevant to talk about, because the story that we posed on December 21st, about the official counts, was a continuation of what we had seen in other Censuses. Apparent movement from the Northeast and the Midwest to the South and the West.

Well, it turns out we have corroborating evidence on that. And that comes from a very large sample survey that we do, called the American Community Survey. That survey allows us to track migration. It asked people where they lived in the prior year. And indeed, other people have been analyzing this.

If you look at the next slide, the Pew Center has been looking at the American Community Survey. And this particular graph, this graphic covers the time period 2005 through 2009. The green arrows are movement into a region. And the orange arrows are movement outside a region.

If you look at the size and the numbers attached to those arrows, you can see that even in that period of time, you could see this larger movement into the West, and a movement outside the Midwest and Northeast. Same with the South.

Well, one of the findings we had on December 21st, there were three states that went through noticeable events on the 2010 Census. Michigan lost population. Texas grew at a 20% rate and got four more Congressional seats. California grew at a smaller rate and, for the first time in many, many years, received no new Congressional seats. These were kind of threshold events for each of these states.

We can look at ACS data and query "Does this make sense? Do we have any corroborating evidence that that makes sense?"

The next slide takes those three states, uses a similar analysis as was done from the Pew Center, and asks the question about movement in and out of those three states. For example, take the contrast between Texas and California there. You can see both states are receiving a lot of in-migrants; people are moving to those states. But you can see that there's out-movement as well. And California, with these ACS data, are showing larger out-movement. This is 2007 through 2009. You could actually go back in time and look at earlier results. So there's a noticeable difference.

And you see the Michigan movement. People are moving to Michigan; more people are moving outside of Michigan.

So what do we do with these sorts of data? This, again, is helpful information for us to gain insight into the official counts that we gave on December 21st, to try to understand the counts and try to decompose them in ways that are useful.

The next slide is something that Bill Frey at the Brookings Institute has worked on, which basically graphs Texas and California and Florida, the movement of people. These are net

migrations. And you can see how distinctive California has been. Although there are a lot of people moving to California, there are people leaving California, too. And it's quite distinctive from Texas and Florida.

So in short, when we compare the 2010 official counts at a state level to these alternative ways of estimating the populations, things fit together; everything points in the same direction. And our auxiliary data sources, the American Community Survey is quite useful for us to gain insight into the why question, why have these counts been achieved.

The third method of evaluating a Census is the post-enumeration survey. This decade we call that program the Census coverage measurement program. It's a large sample survey where we started going back to a probability sample of households with a very detailed interview, with very, very highly skilled interviewers. And they asked who lived there on April 1, and they asked if there was someone there that didn't live there on April 1, where they lived before. This is a very detailed instrument. It is a key tool to asking the question, did we miss anyone? Did we count people twice? Did we measure people that shouldn't have been measured? And that's what we're involved in right now.

The final results of this effort, which is a massive one, won't be available till 2012. But I have some preliminary findings. They are three in number.

First, the percentage of housing units that we find in this sample survey, with higher quality methods, very expensive methods, that match to the 2010 Census, that match rate is higher than it was in 2000. This is a good sign. This means our list of addresses is a good one.

Secondly, the percentage of units that were verified as correct enumerations in 2010 is higher than in 2000. This is a good sign.

And then finally, we have calculated that the percentage of housing units that were found to be duplicates are lower in 2010 than in 2000.

So we have three preliminary indicators. They're preliminary in the following way: We will refine these estimates over time. We expect these results to hold up. I'll let you know if they change. But so far, this is looking good on the post-enumeration survey findings, and we're quite pleased.

I can tell you that that operation is continuing. There are going to be a small number of households that— we beg patience with us, because when we, in these interviews, learn that there's a complicated pattern of residential mobility that we need to follow up on, we're going to knock on their doors one more time just to make sure we got it right. And we beg for the patience of those people who will receive those knocks.

So let me sum up. The results of the three sets of evaluative tools that we have thus far — and they are preliminary — is that the vast majority of quality indicators of the 2010 Census remain positive and suggest a measureable improvement over the 2000 Census. We're very happy with that.

As these become available, and we'll give you the negative signs as well as the positive signs, we'll update you with that. These are preliminary, but heartwarming when we see them.

Let me turn to the future. I'd like to give you a little more detail about the 2010 Census data releases that are coming in February and March. This is when we really start seeing small area counts. This is what a whole lot of people around the country are waiting for. This is where you can look at your neighborhood, you can look at your village, your town, your city, your county and get to understand how it's changed over the years.

We are going to provide data releases for redistricting purposes – these are block level data – on a state-by-state basis between February and the end of March. All of the states will receive their data by April 1, 2011, which is a legal deadline, by the way.

The first step in this process is to give states that are involved in the redistricting process map files so that they can put our counts into smaller geography. About 80% of those maps have been completed and they're on their way out. They're rolling out on a state-by-state basis. And by the end of this month, everybody should have their, what we call shapefiles; these are geographical files.

For each state, the Census Bureau will provide summaries of population totals, as well as data on race, Hispanic or Latino origin, and voting age population for multiple levels of geography within the states, such as blocks, tracts, voting districts, cities, counties, school districts, and so on.

The Census Bureau's also going to provide housing unit counts, along with their occupancy status. This will be an interesting thing to look at, because it's going to give us a snapshot on April 1 of vacancy rates around the country, an issue of great concern to us in this moment of tough economic times.

The way we do this, and it's governed by law, is that we send these geographical products and redistricting data first to the states' leadership, such as the governor and the majority and minority leaders in the legislature. When we received positive evidence that they've received these, then we make them completely available to the public on our website, using a really cool tool called the American FactFinder. So everybody gets it at the same time, except for those political leaders charged with the responsibility for redistricting.

For those of you who've looked at the American FactFinder before, we have good news and bad news. The good news is it's neater than it was before; it has some neat functions. The bad news is you're going to have to learn those neat, new functions. We've tried to

make it as user-friendly as possible. I think you're going to find it attractive, and hopefully easy to learn. We're anxious to get your feedback on that, by the way.

After this April 1 delivery date for all the states, we're going to all have block level data from the short form Census on the vast majority of variables that we're interested in. But there are other things that will be released, much more detailed files in terms of demographic profiles. And those will come out basically continuously through September of 2013. So this goes on for a while. You'll see different kinds of focused products.

During this time, we will also be releasing American Community Survey data, updated data. And the way to keep these straight in your mind is that the Census data are complete counts of the country. The ACS are sample-based estimates. The Census data are fairly lean, because the short form didn't ask you very many things about your household. We don't have that many attributes. The ACS data are wonderfully rich, talking about socioeconomic and education and travel-to-work patterns, and so on.

When we're through with the Census, I can tell you that we would have given back to the society for their efforts in 2010 over 100 billion numbers, 100 billion counts for different levels of geography, for different attributes of the population. And we're proud of that.

Those are my remarks. I want to give you a head's up that we'll probably have a briefing the first week of February. This will be a deeper dive into the block level data that we'll be releasing, to give you some sense of what it looks like.

We'll also have the ability to do some limited comparisons of population estimates with Census data at lower levels of geography. And that will be informative about what's going on with these numbers.

So it will be an update on our long-term evaluation of the 2010 Census.

So I'll stop now and I'm happy to take your questions.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you, Dr. Groves. What we'll do is alternate between questions here in the room and on the phone. We'll take the first question here. Let me ask you that when you do have a question, if you can hold up your hand; we have mics on the side, we'll pass a mic down to you. And then give us your name and your media affiliation.

PABLO SANCHEZ: Pablo Sanchez with Univision News. Dr. Groves, so this is the meat now in the next two months. This is what everybody has been waiting for.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, for vegetarians in the audience, I'm not sure we should say this is the meat. [Laughter] This is really the substance of the Census. We are now delivering. We've been asking you and the rest of the public to give us things last year. This is the return. And we're giving everything you gave us summarized, hopefully in ways that you can find useful for real action decisions at various levels of geography.

You're right. This is the substantive part of it. I won't use the meat word.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, so does a vegetarian in the room have a question?

CAROL MORELLO: Carol Morello, Washington Post. So are you, in this initial data in February and March, are you going to be releasing information on family characteristics, specifically same-sex couples who said they were partners? When will that come out?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The counts that we release in February and March are totally focused on serving the redistricting communities in the states. That's why we release it by state. The data, the attributes that we release, are those that are needed to form districts in compliance with the Voting Rights Act. There are other things that aren't on there. And it's these other products, as we roll out, that will be assembled into different geographies.

This is really a state-oriented next two months. And that's when all of the detail will come out.

You mentioned specifically the same-sex table that we're doing. We've pledged as soon as possible, and we're hoping this is in the May timeframe, to release counts that relationships between the Person #1 in the form and other persons that are labeled as Spouse, but have the same sex. And those counts will be available at that timeframe.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you. I understand we have a question on the phone. So operator, can we have that question, please.

OPERATOR: We have a question from Olivia Winslow, from *Newsday*. Your line is open.

OLIVIA WINSLOW: Thank you. Will the Census Bureau be releasing a schedule of when the states— or redistricting data for the states. So when will the information on New York be coming out, which is where I am.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: This is a very common question. We are releasing it state by state. And through long, over months-long discussions, we've tried to be responsive to the needs of states for the scheduling of the redistricting. And we've taken that into account in our schedule of what states come out first and what states come out later.

Because of the nature of this processing— we are releasing this stuff in real time. It doesn't sit and age for a while. We're getting it out as soon as we can. And we're able to promise that we'll give you a head's up of about ten days, roughly, a week or ten days' notice about when your state comes up. And that schedule will be publicly available, so you'll get a head's up.

And then, the next thing that will happen— we'll send that out to the two sets of leaders at the state level. We need confirmation from them, and then we need about a 24-hour period to get it out on our website so you can download it and do your stuff.

So that's kind of the process.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Question in the room, please.

DANIELLE KURTZLEBEN: Hi, Danielle Kurtzleben, US News. I'm just curious. Were there particular cities or states where you ended up relying on proxies, like building managers, more than in other areas.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yes. We've begun to look at that. So one question is, what are the influences? Why do we end up with more proxies in some place than others? First of all, we do. Your assertion is right. The why is tricky. We've looked at this. It is related to urban areas, because there are a lot of urban areas that have multi-unit structures that have locked entrance doors and are just hard to get into.

It's also true, as we know from various survey data, that people in urban areas are away from their homes, on average, more hours of the day than other places. So it's just harder to get a hold of urban dwellers.

It is also, it appears to be related to the income areas of the area. It's harder in poorer areas to do this. And there are a set of other attributes.

The good thing, there's one kind of silver lining here, building managers tend to be fairly well informed about their occupants, more than neighbors in single-family structure neighborhoods. Building managers have, as part of their duties, to sort of keep track of things. And that's helpful, that's a good thing, if there's any silver lining in there.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Can we get a question from the phone operator?

OPERATOR: We have a question from Lori Weisberg, with *San Diego Union-Tribune*. Your line is open.

LORI WEISBERG: Hi, I want to make sure, and I hope I'm not being repetitive, but I'm trying to still get a sense of when we can find out certain details. You talked about occupancy status for housing units. Would that also include tenure, so we can— I'm trying to get a sense of, let's say I want to know by ethnicity what the homeownership is in areas in San Diego County. Is that something I would find out more in February/March, or is that a later release?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: That's going to be later, yeah. We can't wait to see this, too; we're with you. On the February/March releases, these block level counts in state chunks, we're just going to have the vacancy rate, not the tenure, as it's called, whether it's owned or rented.

STAN ROLARK: Okay, and thank you for that question. Question in the room?

JOSE DELGADO: Jose Delgado from El Nuevo Dia Newspaper, Puerto Rico. I would like to know if it is the same schedule for the Puerto Rico numbers. And also, if in the release of the Hispanic or Latino categories of February/March, are we going to see the breakdown? I mean, if I'm going to see how many Puerto Ricans, for example, are living in Florida?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Question one, the schedule is the same, you're in the same set. The breakdown of the Latino— the separation of Puerto Rico and others will not be part of that release. But that, too, will come later.

STAN ROLARK: And certainly from the Public Information Office, once that data has been planned, we'll get out a schedule for the later releases that come out in the spring and in the summer.

Operator, can we have another question on the phone, please.

OPERATOR: We have a question from Chad Day, with *Arkansas Democrat-Gazette*. Your line is open.

CHAD DAY: Yeah, thanks. My question deals with kind of the format of what we're going to see, state-by-state release. Will any states differ in the type of data, or the way it's organized when it's released? And if so, what are those states? And also, will we be seeing any kind of dummy tables that we can use, and where can I find those?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: First of all, every state's format is exactly the same. They will be boringly consistent, we guarantee you.

In terms of looking at things, you can go to our website. There's a wonderful brochure – whose name I'm forgetting right now. "Strength in Numbers" – that gives you all the detail and lets you know what you're going to receive, the format of that. And that's a great tutorial on what you're going to get.

STAN ROLARK: Let me remind you as well, our website is *www.census.gov*. So you can go there and get that information. If you have any questions, you can call the Public Information Office at 301-336[sic]-3691 or 3030, the final four digits.

Question in the room? Sir, I know you had your hand up.

GARY FEUERBERG: Gary Feuerberg from the Epoch Times. I guess my question is involved with, you have to miss some people; you can't get everyone 100%. Why was it

that when your demographers had their estimate, why are you so pleased that you're in the middle? It seemed to me that you'd be more pleased if you were towards the lower end.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: This is a great question. And let me sort of repeat it to make sure everybody got it: Why are we pleased when we see these results that I just went through, I guess is it in a nutshell.

Let me first say something I guess I didn't say in this press conference. There has never been a perfect Census. I'm willing to speculate that we will never have a perfect Census, not in a democracy anyway. I can imagine a society where we could have a perfect Census; I'm not sure we'd want to live in it.

So how do we evaluate a Census? Well, there's no perfect, there's no gold standard that's better than that, right? It's not the kind of thing where you could see how close it is, say on an examination there's a perfect score, say 100, and you can see how close you are to that. We don't have that outside standard.

So what we do is to look at a lot of different ways that try to do the same thing. When they do agree, that gives us some comfort, because each of those alternative ways has a rationale. There's a logical framework that says "this is a reasonable thing to do to estimate the population."

They all have their strengths and they all have their weaknesses. Admittedly, there are undercounts and overcounts, overestimates and underestimates in every one of these. And the experts know these back and forth, and that's what they argue about when they're in their conferences.

When, however, we see everything sort of pointing in the same direction, that gives us a comfort. Like most sciences, when you do things multiple ways, you get the same

answer, you feel you may have it right then. And it is in that sense that we take comfort in this.

You gave an example – why shouldn't we prefer that the Census count be way above the range of our demographic estimate? Wouldn't that be a better result? I would counter that assertion by saying, we know that in prior decades we've counted some people twice. We know there are duplicates in the Census. And so, a big number is not necessarily the best number.

So it's a very complicated thing, but most of the professionals will say, I think, if you do things multiple ways and you get sort of the same answer, you feel good about that. And that's how we react to this.

GARY FEUERBERG: Can I follow up? The estimate, your official estimate, what was it, 308–

DR. ROBERT GROVES: .7.

GARY FEUERBERG: –million. Can't you feel pretty confident that it's going to be a little bit more, to a number probably– even with the duplication that you said, it's probably a little bit more than the 308.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I'm not going to engage in this seriously until 2012. But I'd love to have a serious conversation about it. Our evaluation isn't finished yet, and that's when we can really get into this.

I do remind us, however, that the post-enumeration survey of 2000 comes out with a small net overcount in the Census. It's completely conceivable that this could happen. We do a whole lot to reduce undercounts. Whenever you do a whole lot to reduce undercounts, you run the risk of counting people twice.

So this is a very tricky thing. So I just refuse to agree with the assertion that big numbers are a better numbers in a Census.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Let me again repeat the number to the Public Information Office. If you have any questions and you want to give us a call, it's 301-763-3691 or 301-763-3030.

So Operator, can we have a question from the phone, please.

OPERATOR: Our question comes from Hope Yen with the *Associated Press*. Your line is open.

HOPE YEN: Yes, hi there, Hope Yen with the AP. I guess I'm wondering regarding the upcoming redistricting data whether perhaps in that February briefing you mentioned, whether the Census Bureau will be offering any kind of basic national picture of some of the demographic changes that we would otherwise have to discern state by state.

And then, related to that, I was also wondering if at that time there might be any preliminary Census assessments made about potential undercounts or overcounts and differential undercounts based on that state data.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The first thing, I take this as a suggestion to us on how we might be useful in February, and we'll take that under advisement.

On the second one, we won't have any— we may have a few more national level data from the post-enumeration survey. We won't have any new process indicators. We will have, for the first time, the ability to compare our population estimates at lower levels of geography. But we're right in the middle of doing that. We won't have that complete. But we're happy to share everything we do have on that.

With regard to commentary on patterns of racial and ethnic residence patterns, we're giving these counts out to you at about the same time we get them. So we wouldn't have had much digestion, but I promise to do as much as we can, because I know we're all interested in that. We'll do the best we can.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Question in the room, please.

AL MILLIKEN: Al Milliken, AM Media. In looking at your handout on the 2010 Census data products, for example you've got national updates coming up November 2011 and May 2012, for American Indian areas. And I was just wondering why, if counts for some of this information is so later then other information you're distributing. And I'm wondering, was there any significant differences in this last Census in the way you counted American Indian areas?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: I don't know the specific answer to your— well, the answer to your second one is, we're constantly working on ways of improving. I think, just from my personal experience, and in talking to people involved in 2000, that the cooperation and partnership activities with American Indian reservations and Indian country in general was really a wonderful part of this Census. You could probably still go to the Indian country counts website, I bet it's still up. It's just a wonderful thing. So we worked well with tribes.

The schedule of these things I can't speak to, but we could get back to you on the why of that.

I know assembling different geographies and having these profiles is a scheduling problem in general. And we want to have focused reports that speak to different audiences, but I don't know the exact reason for the schedule.

STAN ROLARK: If you want to follow up, give us a call. I'll repeat the number right at the end of the press conference.

Operator, do we have anyone on the phone with a question, please?

OPERATOR: Yes, we have a question from Anthony DeBarros, *USA Today*. Your line is open.

ANTHONY DeBARROS: Good afternoon. My question concerns the schedule again for the releases. And I'm wondering whether you could give us a sense of the specific day or week when we would see the first of the states to be released.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The first batch will be delivered in the first week of February. And we'll alert you to that, what the identity of those states are, hopefully seven days before that, seven to ten days.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you. A question in the room, please? We have one in the back.

BOB COSTANTINI: Hi, I'm Bob Costantini with CNN. Considering the large increase in Texas, if you will— they're getting, what, three, four more seats?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Four.

BOB COSTANTINI: Four more seats. Considering the increase in Texas, I don't imagine a lot of people moving down there to lead this rural, cowboy kind of life, or whatever. Is most of that increase, can you give us some context? Is at least most of that increase in urban and very suburban, close-in suburban areas?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The decomposition of the growth of Texas we're going to know very soon from these releases. I remind us that cities like Houston and surrounding

cities received a lot of in-migrants from Hurricane Katrina, who remain there. So that's kind of a special note about Texas.

And then, as these graphics showed you before, even though there's movement in and out of Texas, that movement into Texas predominates in real ways. And the decomposition of this to Dallas/Fort Worth, versus Houston and Austin, and so on, and San Antonio, we're going to have in just a matter of weeks. I can't wait to see what it looks like.

And then, we'll have our population estimates data there. You'll be able to do similar things with regard to change over time and how it fits with the official counts.

So it's a non-answer to your question.

BOB COSTANTINI: I figured that might be the answer.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Operator, can we have another question from the phone, please?

OPERATOR: We have a question from Dave Sheingold with *Bergen Record*. Your line is open.

DAVE SHEINGOLD: Hi, thanks for taking the call. Do you have a timeframe for when we'll be able to get the—

DR. ROBERT GROVES: We're having trouble hearing you.

DAVE SHEINGOLD: Is that any better?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yes, much better.

DAVE SHEINGOLD: Okay, great. Do you know when you will be making available to the media the TIGER file, the GIS files? And also, for the actual data when it is released, what, if any, embargo will there be for the media so that we can have a little time to digest this and make good sense out of the data?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The first is about the shapefiles, I think. And the release on the shapefiles— well, by the end of the month, I guess, all the shapefiles will be up for all states. For everyone. You and your neighbor can download these.

Now, the embargo issue, you as a journalist are going to get the data the same day, the same instant, actually, that everybody in the world will get it. These are pretty big files. They're down to block level. They're a lot to absorb. And to follow our principle of being transparent as possible, we're releasing that to everyone.

There will be many, many, many, many, many stories out of these files, because there's a story for every county. There's almost a story for every block that could be written. And there's a lot of time that we all need, as a country, to absorb these.

So there's no embargo on that.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Do we have a question in the room?

CAROL MORELLO: Carol Morello, Washington Post. It's a little off topic, but given the events in Tucson last weekend, can you tell us if there have been any changes to security arrangements to the regional offices?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Well, first of all, the events in Tucson were tragic, as we all know. We have made no visible changes in security procedures, to my knowledge, in our facilities. We, as you know, have people every day who, as part of their job, are knocking on the doors of American residents throughout the country. As always, it's useful to note

that they have been trained for their own safety to be aware, to be streetwise, to be cautious. And we care about them deeply, and whenever we find any foibles in our training, or any things that we can do better, we try to repair them. But to my knowledge, there's been no change because of the Tucson event.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Can we have a question from the phone, please?

OPERATOR: We have a question from Diana Montenegro with *Radio Bilingue*. Your line is open.

DIANA MONTENEGRO: Yes, thank you. With regards to the redistricting numbers, I just want to clarify. I know that you mentioned they're being released state by state as they come in. But is that beginning the February date, or is that until the April 1st date?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Starting the first week of February, ending the last week of March, those files, state by state, will be released.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you for that question. Do we have another question in the room? Operator, do we have another question on the phone?

OPERATOR: Yes, we have a question from Laura Parker with *AOL News*. Your line is open.

LAURA PARKER: Hi, this is Laura Parker from AOL News. Can you just clarify a little bit about the release of the state-by-state data for the redistricting purposes. Are you going to put out the data in the states that will have changes in the number of members they have, either by adding or by losing a member, because those states, there may be more controversy over the number than in other states?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: As I said, every state will get the data, and we will all get the data. The schedule has been arranged prior to our knowledge of the results of the count, trying to be respectful and helpful to those states that need actually to do their redistricting early because of internal election schedules. And that's what drove that.

So the real answer to your question is, no, we haven't changed the schedule based on the Census counts in any way. Rather, we're driven by the needs for redistricting schedules.

LAURA PARKER: Then if you've got that schedule, what will be the first dates?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Those, we will identify probably the first of February, or maybe the last week of January, something like that.

STAN ROLARK: I think we have time for two more questions. Do we have any questions in the room? Operator, another question on the phone, please.

OPERATOR: We have a question from Max Rust with the *Chicago Tribune*. Your line is open.

MAX RUST: Yes, hello, my question was, could you repeat what you said about the new ACS data being released, when that's going to release. And then also, what geographic level that this data will cover.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: The next American Community Survey release is going to be a set of three-year estimates. That should be later this month, I believe.

__: Yesterday.

DR. ROBERT GROVES: Yesterday! Early this month. [Laughter] And those are for areas that are basically of size that are 22,000 or more, or something like that.

We'll continue to release ACS estimates. You can think of these as one-year estimates for the big areas. These will come out fall-ish. Then we'll release five-year estimates for really small areas. And three-year estimates for slightly larger areas.

From now on, we have reached the stable and wonderful point of the American Community Survey that we can tell, honestly, even very small communities that they're going to get an updated estimate every year now – of their population, on socioeconomic characteristics, and others – that will describe the last five-year period.

So we released 2005 through 2009 recently. Next fall, it will be 2006 through 2010 for very small areas. This is a wonderful thing for a small city council, small cities to have planning data that is much more timely than we were able to do with the long form once every ten years.

STAN ROLARK: If there are no other questions in the room, we have one more on the phone. Operator, can I have that question, please?

OPERATOR: Our final question comes from Robert Wang with *the Canton Repository*. Your line is open.

ROBERT WANG: Thank you, sir. Is the order of the states for the redistricting data, for the release of the redistricting data, is that solely due to their deadlines on redistricting?

DR. ROBERT GROVES: As best as possible, we've tried to follow that. That was the key guidance. There are other processing issues that arise in the schedule, but the dominant one from a customer viewpoint is to try to serve their needs on the time schedule that they needed.

STAN ROLARK: Thank you. That'll be the final question for today. So in closing, let me just bring to your attention a few things that we have planned a little later in the month.

We have a couple of webinars that we're going to put on for the media. One, of the new American FactFinder. Dr. Groves mentioned that we're pretty excited about the rebirth of American FactFinder. So on January 18th, we're going to have a webinar. We'll get information out to you, or you can call our office.

On January 24th, we're going to have a webinar on redistricting. So we'll talk to you about the redistricting data program and give you some background information on that.

So again, you can go to our website, www.census.gov and get information on this press conference, as well as other media releases that we had. If you have any questions, if anyone wants to follow up with the Public Information Office, please feel free to do so. That number, again it's 301-763-3030 or 301-763-3691.

So with that, we'll end today's press conference. Thank you for attending.

END